



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/933,279	08/20/2001	Lie-zhong Gong	1941. PKG	4642

7590 06/28/2004

Cynthia L. Foulke
National Starch and Chemical Company
10 Finderne Avenue
Brigdewater, NJ 08807

EXAMINER

GOFF II, JOHN L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1733

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

There

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/933,279

Applicant(s)

GONG ET AL.

Examiner

John L. Goff

Art Unit

1733

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 12 April 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 11-14,20-22,24,29-32,34 and 39.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 23,25-28,33 and 35-38.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues "In the process of Jones two substrates are welded together. One skilled in the relevant arts would not equate the process of bonding using an adhesive with the process of welding." Applicant further refers to page 7, lines 29-33 of Jones and the dictionary definition of "weld". It is noted Jones teaches two embodiments where the first embodiment comprises welding two workpieces without weld material and the second embodiment comprises welding two workpieces with a polymeric film of weld material, the polymeric film of weld material comprising a polymer of the same type as the workpieces and an energy absorbing ingredient. The passage referred to by applicant is the first embodiment. However, the weld material of the second embodiment is melted and used to bond two workpieces together such that it is an "adhesive". Applicant further argues, "The examiner is also referred to the dictionary definition of "adhesive"". The definition of adhesive (noun) supplied by applicant states "an adhesive substance (as glue or cement)". The definition of adhesive (adj) supplied by applicant states "tending to adhere or cause adherence". Thus, the film of weld material taught by Jones is an adhesive. Furthermore, it is noted the claims require "a reactivatable adhesive" that is activated by absorbing energy such that it melts. This is what occurs in the second embodiment taught by Jones. Applicant further argues, "In one embodiment of Shaw (see col 4, lines 43-47), it is suggested that a thermoplastic film may be fed between the nips of the corrugating rolls and subsequently subjected to I-R radiation to melt the film into an adhesive layer. Such a disclosure fails to teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention wherein an adhesive is preapplied to a substrate (i.e., the substrate has applied thereon a reactivatable adhesive)." Shaw teaches sequentially feeding a substrate medium (1) to corrugating nip rolls (10) and (11), applying adhesive to the substrate medium after passing through the corrugating rolls, applying a liner (2) to the adhesive, and then applying I-R energy to activate the adhesive and bond the substrate medium to the liner. Shaw further teaches as alternative to applying the adhesive after feeding the substrate medium through the corrugating nip rolls is to feed a thermoplastic film (activated by exposure to I-R energy) through the corrugating nip rolls. Thus, the thermoplastic film (reactivated adhesive) is applied to the substrate medium during the feeding through corrugating nip rolls and prior to exposure to I-R energy. Applicant further argues, "While Shaw teaches feeding of a thermoplastic film which is later melted, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the film is melted onto a substrate, solidified and then reactivated (again melted) in order to bond the substrate to a second substrate. The claims merely require the reactivatable adhesive is applied to a substrate, and "applied" does not require melting and solidifying such that the claims are not commensurate in scope with this argument. .



John L. Goff



JEFF H. AFTERGUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300